



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/029,458

12/21/2001

Travis J. Parry

10019040-1

5480

7590

03/03/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY

Intellectual Property Administration

P.O. Box 272400

Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PARK, CHAN S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/029,458

Applicant(s)

PARRY ET AL.

Examiner

CHAN S. PARK

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-8,10,11,13-16,18 and 20-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-8,10,11,13-16,18 and 20-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Tranlong

Chan S. Park

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 1/9/06, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 11, 13-16, 18 and 20-37** are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 11, 13-16, 18 and 20-37** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:
Line 3, "a print ready version" should be -- the print ready version --.
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 13, 14, 18 and 20-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strobel et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,751,732 (hereinafter Strobel) in view of Walker et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,111,953 (hereinafter Walker).

4. With respect to claim 1, Strobel teaches a method for facilitating secure printing (abstract and fig. 1), comprising:

receiving with a printer an untranslated document to be printed (fig. 2A);

determining on the printer that the document cannot be printed in its present form (fig. 2A);

transmitting a key that is needed to translate the document to the printer from a nearby portable computing device (col. 3, lines 58-62 & fig. 2B); and

translating/decrypting the document using the received key at the printer (fig. 2B & col. 6, lines 28-42).

Strobel, however, does not teach the method of translating/decrypting the document at the portable computing device.

Walker, the same field of endeavor of encrypting/decrypting document art, teaches the method of transmitting an encrypted document from a printer to a computing device wherein the computing device translates/decrypts the encrypted

document and sends the translated/decrypted document back to the printer (fig. 5 & col. 7, line 61 – col. 8, line 15).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the decryption module along with the decryption key at the portable computing device of Strobel.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to maintain the decryption module and the keys at a single location to provide more security.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Strobel with Walker to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

5. With respect to claim 3, the combination of Strobel and Walker teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the untraslated document is encrypted (fig. 2 of Strobel & col. 7, line 61 – col. 8, line 15 of Walker).

6. With respect to claim 5, the combination of Strobel and Walker teaches the method of claim 1, wherein transmitting the document comprises wireless transmitting the document and wherein receiving the print ready version of the document comprises wirelessly receiving the print ready version of the document (col. 3, lines 58-62 & fig. 2B of Walker).

7. With respect to claims 6-8, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 3 and 5, are applicable.

8. With respect to claims 13 and 14, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 3 and 5, are applicable.

9. With respect to claims 18 and 20-22, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 3 and 5, are applicable.
10. With respect to claims 23 and 24, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 3 and 5, are applicable.
11. With respect to claims 25-27, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 3 and 5, are applicable.
12. With respect to claims 28-30, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 3 and 5, are applicable.
13. With respect to claims 31-33, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 3 and 5, are applicable.
14. With respect to claims 34 and 35, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 3 and 5, are applicable.
15. With respect to claims 36 and 37, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 3 and 5, are applicable.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Strobel and Walker as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Roberts et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,650,431 (hereinafter Roberts).

16. With respect to claims 10 and 11, the combination of Strobel and Walker teaches the method of claim 6, but it does not teach explicitly that the protected document is a protected and untranslated document.

Roberts, the same field of endeavor of the document printing art, teaches the method for translating a document at a computing device (col. 10, lines 37-53).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the translating method of Roberts into the secure printing method of Strobel and Walker.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been obvious to facilitate the printing process by both unprotecting and translating the document before it is transmitted to the printer. It would eliminate the step of translating the document into the print ready format by the printing device. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to unprotect/decrypt the document before the translating step because the document could not have been translated if it was encrypted/protected.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10 and 11.

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Strobel and Walker as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Roberts

17. With respect to claims 15 and 16, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 10 and 11, are applicable.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **CHAN S. PARK** whose telephone number is (571) 272-7409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

csp
February 24, 2006

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Chan S. Park
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

